

APL 20130008

RECEIVED

AUG 21 2013

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
COUNTER

August 21, 2013

Kernen Lien, Sr. Planner  
Development Services Dept., Planning Div.  
CITY OF EDMONDS  
121 Fifth Avenue North  
Edmonds WA 98020

RE: Appeal of Architectural Design Board Decision Regarding PLN20130022 -  
Point Edwards Building 10

Dear Mr. Lien:

This letter is on behalf of the following parties: Clair and Bill Widing along with Jon and Laura Fleming. We are formally submitting an Appeal to the Edmonds City Council pursuant to ECDC 20.07.004. In accordance with Section C, the following information is presented:

1. Appellants: Clair and Bill Widing 21605 Chinook Rd Woodway, Wa 98020 (425-771-7081) along with Jon and Laura Fleming 21635 Chinook Rd Woodway, Wa 98020 (206-321-6200).
2. Standing: We have submitted numerous comments regarding this project and are a Party of Record and have standing to submit an Appeal.
3. Application: PLN20130022 - Point Edwards Building 10 Design Review.

4. Statement of Grounds for Appeal and Statement of Facts: The Decision of the ADB does not conform to nor meet the design criteria set forth in ECDC 20.11.030 and the Urban Design General Objectives of the Community Culture and Urban Design Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. While the ADB was specifically directed to enter written Findings and Conclusions and has now done so, such *post hoc* rationalizations cannot obscure the fact that the ADB's Decision in certain key aspects is unsupported by the record, and is contrary to the standards and criteria as mentioned above. Specifically, we are appealing based on the following:

a. C.8.a ↓ Building 10 is a long, high and massive building that as proposed, will block our views to the north. Stepping back the building does not reduce nor modulate the height of the structure. A practical method to reduce the bulk and mass is to reduce the height of the building to four stories with the east wing reduced to three stories.

b. C8.c ↓ The height and mass of the building are inconsistent with the criterion. The east wing of the building is five stories high, and since there are no other five-story buildings in the "Edmonds bowl" the building does not connect with the balance of other buildings at Pt. Edwards and the City of Edmonds. We feel the ADB findings do not address this issue nor attempt to demonstrate how the criterion is met.

c. C.10. B and C ↓ The lighting on the south west side of Pine Street is inconsistent with both design criteria C.10. B. and C. The City's standard street light masts are much higher than the architectural lights on the north side of Pine and cast a greater and brighter lighted area that spills off

site into adjacent existing residences. The lights are out of character with the design aesthetic of the streetscape infrastructure. The dissimilar street lighting design (architectural lights on one street frontage and the higher lights on the other street frontage) expresses a visual lack of coordinated site/infrastructure planning. The higher head lights(referred to as Cobra lighting) should be replaced with architectural lighting as was originally agreed to between the Town of Woodway and the developer. The ADB's findings on this point (Finding 18) do not address the aesthetic and design conflicts, but instead recite only that the City was not party to the agreement with the developer and the Town. Of which we were a party to with the Town of Woodway.

d. C.13.c ↓ The finding that the single family residence to the south is "substantially higher" and thus their view is preserved is contrary to the facts in the record. Placing a four and five story building in front of a single family resident that is 27 feet high where the difference in the ground level grade at the parking lot to the ground level grade of the single family resident is only 24' (164' versus 188') is not "substantially higher". They will be looking into the parking lot not the view they currently have of the Puget Sound.

e. C.13.d ↓ The finding is misleading and inaccurate. This Comprehensive Plan Objective includes the following language: "Integrate buildings into their site by stepping the mass of the building along steep sloping sites." The finding states that the "southern (uphill) facade of the building extending above average grade is two stories in height". The building actually extends three stories in height above the average grade, since the parking lot/building sits atop the average historical grade with the surface parking lot planned to sit on top of that parking structure. Thus the parking

structure plus two stories of residential units equates to three stories above the average grade and should be included in the calculation; IE average grade is 151 and top elevation is 191. (See submittal package slide #27) As proposed, Building 10 is not being “stepped” into the slope, rather, it is being installed on top of the slope. (Note: This applies to Design Criteria D.1.a. as well).

f. D.1.a. This finding completely ignores how the building will meet the requirement to preserve views. The ADB states that the residence to the south in the Town of Woodway will have their views impacted. It not only impacts it but eliminates it, along with the impact of both our homes. The ADB does not attempt to offer any explanation as to what mitigation could be done to meet this requirement. This design objective clearly has not been met.

g. D.1.b. This finding completely ignores the design objective which requires maintenance of the small scale of “historic Edmonds”. The finding instead compares the building with the other Point Edwards buildings, which are clearly not part of historic Edmonds. This would set a precedent for the future of Edmonds.

h. D.2.b. ↓ The finding states that stepping back the building will reduce the bulk and mass of the building. Stepping back a portion of the building will not reduce the bulk unless the height of the building is also stepped “down”. The finding also states that the footprint has been reduced 25% from the original proposal. This is true however it’s not relevant since the proposal under review is the current proposal not the original 2006 proposal. Although the footprint has been decreased the height has been increased over the original proposal.

5.     Specific Relief Sought: We request that the City of Edmonds City Council reverse or modify the Decision of the ADB. If the Council chooses to modify the Decision, we request that the Application be modified to:

- a.     Reduce the building from five stories to four:
- b.     Step the eastern portion of the building down to three stories; and
- c.     With the reduction of the building size, reduce the parking spaces along the rock wall facing the single family residence.
- d.     Require all street and parking lot lighting to be consistent with the architectural standards already installed in the Point Edwards community and on the north side of Pine Street.

6.     Statement of True Facts: We have read the Appeal and submit that the contents are true.

Clair Widing  
Bill Wiidng  
Jon Fleming  
Laura Fleming